



AF JFW

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)		Application No.	10/609,216
		Filing Date	June 26, 2003
		First Named Inventor	Karl H. Mauritz
		Art Unit	2186
		Examiner Name	Patel, Hetul B.
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	15	Attorney Docket Number	42P16326

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Response <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> PTO/SB/08 <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Basic Filing Fee <input type="checkbox"/> Declaration/POA <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 80px; width: 100%;"></div>
Remarks		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT	
Firm or Individual name	Gordon R. Lindeen III, Reg. No. 33,192 BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Signature	
Date	October 3, 2006

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.			
Typed or printed name	Debbie Casias		
Signature	Debbie Casias	Date	October 3, 2006



Docket No.: 42390P16326

Patent

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re the Patent Application of:)
)
Karl H. Mauritz)
)
Serial No.: 10/609,216) Art Unit: 2186
)
Filed: June 26, 2003)
)
For: Electrical Solution to Enable High-Speed) Examiner: Patel, Hetul B.
Memory Interfaces)
)
)
)
)

Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313

AMENDED APPEAL BRIEF
IN SUPPORT OF APPELLANT'S APPEAL
TO THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Sir:

Applicants (hereafter "Appellants") hereby submit this Amended Brief in response to the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief mailed September 8, 2006 and in further support of its appeal from a final decision by the Examiner, mailed March 14, 2006 in the above-captioned case. Appellants respectfully request consideration of this appeal by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for allowance of the above-captioned patent application.

An oral hearing is not desired.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	REAL PARTY IN INTEREST.....	3
II.	RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES.....	3
III.	STATUS OF THE CLAIMS.....	3
IV.	STATUS OF AMENDMENTS.....	3
V.	SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.....	4
VI.	GROUND OF REJECTION.....	5
VII.	ARGUMENT AGAINST FIRST REJECTION.....	6
VIII.	ARGUMENT AGAINST SECOND REJECTION.....	7
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	8
X.	CLAIMS APPENDIX	i
XI.	EVIDENCE APPENDIX	vi
XII.	RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX	vi

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The invention is assigned to Intel Corporation of 2200 Mission College Boulevard, Santa Clara, California 95052-8119.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

To the best of Appellant's knowledge, there are no appeals or interferences that are related to, will directly affect, will be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the present appeal.

III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-30 are currently pending in this application. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been allowed. All pending claims were rejected in the final Office action mailed March 14, 2006 and are the subject of this appeal.

Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as not described in the original specification.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 14, 17, 19, 20, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated.

The remaining claims stand rejected as obvious, but these rejections rely on the anticipation rejection.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on March 14, 2006, rejecting claims 1-30, Appellants timely filed a Notice of Appeal on June 14, 2006.

A copy of all claims on appeal is attached hereto as Appendix A.

V. SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Claim 1 refers to a circuit with the following elements:

a plurality of memory modules (item 204, Page 9, line16-Page 10, line 8);

a memory controller coupled to the plurality of memory modules (item 112, Page 9, line16-Page 10, line 8);

a resistive bus splitter (item 211, 213, 215, Page 9, line16-Page 10, line 8) coupled between the plurality of memory modules and the memory controller to split signals communicated between the plurality of memory modules and the memory controller, the resistive bus splitter having a specific resistance for each memory module (items Rs, Page 10, lines 11-19, Page 13, lines 16-17); and

a plurality of terminators to reduce signal reflections corresponding to the split signals (Page 11, lines 2-10, Page 15, lines 9-10) .

Claim 14 is directed to operating a circuit like that of Claim 1 and the same portions of the specification apply.

Claim 27 is directed to a computer system as follows:

a central processing unit (CPU) (item 102 Page 6, line 15-Page 7, line 6);

a graphics accelerator (item 130, Page 7, line 16-Page 8, line8) coupled to the CPU to generate an image;

a plurality of memory modules (item 115, 204 Page 7, lines 9-15, Page 9, line16-Page 10, line 8);

a memory controller (item 112, Page 7, line 9, Page 9, line16-Page 10, line 8); coupled to the plurality of memory modules and the CPU;

a resistive bus splitter (this is similar to that of Claim 1, discussed above); and

a plurality of terminators (also similar to that of Claim 1).

The remaining claims are dependent claims.

One of the problems addressed by Claim 1 is described in the present application in paragraphs 5 and 6 as follows: dual in-line memory modules (DIMMs) are generally

routed in parallel (i.e., with one signal visiting each DIMM). As the signal travels from chipset to DIMM then to another DIMM, each DIMM represents an electrical discontinuity (or impedance discontinuity), which degrades the signal, in part, because a portion of the wave reflects back to the chipset (also called a reflection) and another portion is passed to the next DIMM.

The signal reflection problem is further exasperated in multiple DIMM configurations because each DIMM may generate an additional reflection for each signal line it shares with other DIMMs. Also, as the data rates increase, the detrimental affects become increasingly difficult to manage.

VI. GROUND OF REJECTION

A. Claims 1-30 stand rejected under the 35 U.S.C. §112 written description requirement. The issue is whether the resistors shown in Figures 2 and 4 support a limitation of "a resistive bus splitter having a specific resistance for each memory module."

B. Claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 14, 17, and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Morris (USPN 6,862,185). The issue is whether Morris, having no indication of how a connection is made, anticipates the specific limitation of "a resistive bus splitter ... to split signals communicated between the plurality of memory modules and the memory controller, the resistive bus splitter having a specific resistance for each memory module".

C. The remaining claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 based on various combinations of Morris with other references. These rejections all depend on the Morris 102(e) rejection and are not argued separately.

VII. ARGUMENT AGAINST FIRST REJECTION

The Resistors Rs Clearly show a Resistance Sufficient to Support a Claim to "Having a Specific Resistance" as Recited in Claim 1.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner would appear to suggest that there is no support for a specific resistance in the originally filed application and points to the discussion of impedance in paragraphs 24 and 25 of the specification.

Applicants are willing to amend the claims from "resistance" to "impedance" if that will overcome the rejection. Such an amendment was proffered in an amendment after final, however, the Examiner refused to enter the amendment and refused to withdraw the rejection.

Referring to Figure 2, it specifically shows a resistor between each DIMM connector and the Controller. These resistors will have a resistance as recited in the claim. This resistance is characterized in paragraph 22 (page 10, line 11). On page 13, lines 17-18 it is stated that the bus splitters are resistive. Applicants respectfully submit that these teaching in the application provide ample support for the splitter having a specific resistance for each memory module.

The Examiner argues that only impedance is taught in paragraphs 24 and 25 and that this does not support resistance because impedance depends also on frequency. While impedance may depend on frequency it also depends on resistance. While the impedance for each memory module will change with frequency, the resistance will not. Since embodiments of the present invention may be operated at a variety of different frequencies, it is more convenient to refer to the resistance. The resistors in the drawings clearly suggest, a particular resistance for each module.

While the arguments above are directed only to Claim 1, they are believed to apply also to the other pending claims.

VIII. ARGUMENT AGAINST SECOND REJECTION

Absent any Teaching of How Signals are Distributed "a Resistive Bus Splitter Having a Specific Resistance (or Impedance) for Each Memory Module" as Recited in Claim 1 is not Anticipated.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4, 7-8, 14, 17 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as being anticipated by Morris, U.S. Patent No. 6,862,185 ("Morris"). The Examiner asserts that Morris shows memory modules 201, and a memory controller 207. The memory bus splitter are not shown, but the Examiner suggests that these are embedded in the memory board 203 to split the signals to the many connectors 202. Applicants suggest that since Morris makes no teaching or suggestion to the contrary, it should be assumed that the memory bus of Morris is completely conventional. In other words, the same bus lines connect in parallel to all of the memory chips in the memory modules without any splitter. This is the conventional approach described in the BACKGROUND section of the present application.

Referring to Claim 1, for example, it recites, *inter alia*:

"a resistive bus splitter coupled between the plurality of memory modules and the memory controller to split signals communicated between the plurality of memory modules and the memory controller, the resistive bus splitter having a specific resistance for each memory module."

As shown in Figure 2 of the present application, each splitter 211, 213, 215 not only splits the signals communicated between the memory modules 204 and the memory controller 112, they also have a specific resistance for each memory module, shown in Figure 2 as R_s and indicated by the resistors on either side of the split. The specification at paragraph 22 provides some examples of how the resistances might be determined.

Morris simply has no information at all about how any busses connect any of the components together.

Accordingly Claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the reference. Claims 14 and 27 contain similar recitations and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons discussed above. The remaining claims are believed to be allowable also on similar grounds and for the particular recitations set forth expressly in each claim, respectively.

While the arguments above are directed only to Claim 1, they are believed to apply also to the other pending claims.

The remaining rejections all rely on the second rejection. Accordingly, if Morris does not anticipate Claim 1, then the remaining claims are not rendered obvious.

IX. CONCLUSION

Appellants respectfully submit that all the appealed claims in this application are patentable and request that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences overrule the Examiner and direct allowance of the rejected claims.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 10/3/6



Gordon R. Lindeen III
Attorney for Appellant
Registration Number: 33,192

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(303)-740-1980

X. APPENDIX OF CLAIMS (37 C.F.R. § 1.192(c)(7))

1. A circuit comprising:
a plurality of memory modules;
a memory controller coupled to the plurality of memory modules;
a resistive bus splitter coupled between the plurality of memory modules and the memory controller to split signals communicated between the plurality of memory modules and the memory controller, the resistive bus splitter having a specific resistance for each memory module; and
a plurality of terminators to reduce signal reflections corresponding to the split signals.
2. The circuit of claim 1 wherein the plurality of terminators are embedded in each of the plurality of memory modules.
3. The circuit of claim 1 wherein the plurality of terminators are embedded in the memory controller.
4. The circuit of claim 1 wherein the memory modules are dual in-line memory modules (DIMMs).
5. The circuit of claim 1 further including a reference voltage generator to generate a reference voltage corresponding to a memory chip voltage.
6. The circuit of claim 5 wherein the reference voltage is provided to the plurality of memory modules and the memory controller.
7. The circuit of claim 1 wherein the resistive bus splitter includes miniature integrated resistor packs.

8. The circuit of claim 1 further including a plurality of memory expander chips (MXCs) coupled between the resistive bus splitter and the plurality of memory modules.

9. The circuit of claim 8 wherein the plurality of MXCs include a micro-controller to perform tasks locally.

10. The circuit of claim 8 wherein each of the plurality of MXCs include a built in bi-directional cache to decrease latency and increase throughput efficiency.

11. The circuit of claim 8 wherein a data rate between the memory controller and the plurality of MXCs runs at a relatively higher bandwidth than that of directly supported DIMMs.

12. The circuit of claim 8 wherein each of the plurality of MXCs include functionality selected from a group comprising local refresh generation, dynamic address space re-mapping, access re-ordering, access coalescing, memory power-on self-test (POST), and local management of open pages.

13. The circuit of claim 8 wherein a portion of the plurality of MXCs are coupled to each other in series.

14. A method comprising:
 sending address signals from a memory controller to a plurality of memory modules through a resistive bus splitter;
 splitting the address signals communicated between the plurality of memory modules and the memory controller at the resistive bus splitter;
 providing a specific resistance to the address signals for each memory module at the resistive bus splitter; and

terminating the address signals to reduce signal reflections corresponding to the split signals.

15. The method of claim 14 wherein terminating comprises terminating at terminators embedded in each of the plurality of memory modules.

16. The method of claim 14 wherein terminating comprises terminating at terminators embedded in the memory controller.

17. The method of claim 14 wherein the memory modules are dual in-line memory modules (DIMMs).

18. The method of claim 14 further including generating a reference voltage corresponding to a memory chip voltage and providing the reference voltage to the plurality of memory modules and to the memory controller.

19. The method of claim 18 wherein the resistive bus splitter includes a miniature resistive splitter on a PCB.

20. The method of claim 14 wherein the resistive bus splitter includes miniature integrated resistor packs.

21. The method of claim 14 sending address signals further includes sending the address signals through a plurality of memory expander chips (MXCs) between the resistive bus splitter and the plurality of memory modules.

22. The method of claim 21 wherein the plurality of MXCs enable access to relatively larger memory arrays.

23. The method of claim 21 wherein each of the plurality of MXCs include one or more items selected from a list comprising a micro-controller to perform tasks

locally and a built in bi-directional cache to decrease latency and increase throughput efficiency.

24. The method of claim 21 wherein a data rate between the memory controller and the plurality of MXCs runs at a relatively higher bandwidth than that of directly supported DIMMs.

25. The method of claim 21 wherein each of the plurality of MXCs include functionality selected from a group comprising local refresh generation, dynamic address space re-mapping, access re-ordering, access coalescing, memory power-on self-test (POST), and local management of open pages.

26. The method of claim 21 wherein a portion of the plurality of MXCs are coupled to each other in series.

27. A computer system comprising:
a central processing unit (CPU);
a graphics accelerator coupled to the CPU to generate an image;
a plurality of memory modules;
a memory controller coupled to the plurality of memory modules and the CPU;
a resistive bus splitter coupled between the plurality of memory modules and the memory controller to split signals communicated between the plurality of memory modules and the memory controller, the resistive bus splitter having a specific resistance for each memory module; and
a plurality of terminators to reduce signal reflections corresponding to the split signals.

28. The computer system of claim 27 wherein the resistive bus splitter includes miniature integrated resistor packs.

29. The computer system of claim 27 further including a plurality of memory expander chips coupled between the resistive bus splitter and the plurality of memory modules to perform memory functions independent of the memory controller.

30. The computer system of claim 29 wherein the memory expander chip functions include at least one of refresh, dynamic address space re-mapping and memory power-on self-test (POST).

XI. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

XII. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.